

### REMARKS

Claims 61-70 are pending in this application, of which Claims 61 and 66 are in independent form. Claims 61 and 66 have been amended to define still more clearly what Applicants regard as their invention..

In the Office Action, Claims 61-70 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,195,077 (Gyouten et al.) in view of U.S. Patent 5,867,953 (Fukuda et al.).

Independent Claim 61 is directed to a display apparatus that comprises a plurality of column wirings each connected to a respective set of display devices, at least one row wiring connected to said display devices, and a respective pulse width modulator ("PWM") provided for each column wiring. The PWMs each output, for their respective column wiring, a modulation signal having a pulse width determined according to a luminance signal that is to be displayed by a respective one of the display devices. Each PWM comprises a correction circuit that (1) receives as an input a luminance signal that is to be displayed by the display device corresponding to the column wiring that is adjacent to that to which the PWM in question supplies its modulation signal, (2) compares the luminance signal received as an input with the luminance signal to be displayed by the display device corresponding to the column wiring to which the PWM in question supplies its modulation signal, and (3) corrects the modulation signal that it is to supply based on the comparing result, such as to suppress an effect or a luminance of the display devices supplied with the modulation signal from the pulse width modulator due to waveform

modulation of the modulation signal supplied from the pulse modulation by a level change of the modulation signal supplied to the adjacent column wiring.

Applicants note that the Office Action concedes that *Gyouten* does not teach or suggest correcting a PWM signal according to a difference in luminance between signals of two adjacent columns, and that Claim 61 would be allowable over that patent taken alone. As Applicants understand it, the Examiner differs from Applicants in considering that one of ordinary skill would have had adequate motivation to modify the *Gyouten* approach by incorporating correction on that basis, in view of the teaching in *Fukuda* of luminance level correction, while Applicants believe that one of only ordinary skill would have had no such motivation. More fundamentally, however, Applicants have previously pointed out that the proposed combination of these two documents, even assuming satisfactory motivation to be present, would not have produced the result obtained by the apparatus of Claim 61, namely, to prevent waveform distortion caused by crosstalk (Response dated July 9, 2003, at page 3). Applicants note that Claim 61 affirmatively recites that the processing called for in that claim is performed in such manner as to produce a correction that prevents such distortion “such as to suppress an effect or a luminance of said display devices supplied with the modulation signal from the pulse width modulator due to waveform modulation of the modulation signal supplied from the pulse modulation by a level change of the modulation signal supplied to the adjacent column wiring”). For at least that reason, Applicants submit that Claim 61 is allowable over *Fukuda* and *Gyouten*, taken in any possible combination (assuming such combination even to be permissible).

Independent Claim 66 is similar to Claim 61 as regards the arguments presented above, and is also deemed allowable over any permissible combination of *Gyouten* and *Fukuda*.

The other claims in this application are each dependent from one or the other of the independent claims discussed above and are therefore believed patentable for the same reasons. Since each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual consideration of the patentability of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

This Amendment After Final Action is believed clearly to place this application in condition for allowance and its entry is therefore believed proper under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116. In any event, however, entry of this Amendment After Final Action, as an earnest effort to advance prosecution and reduce the number of issues, is respectfully requested. Should the Examiner believe that issues remain outstanding, he is respectfully requested to contact Applicants' undersigned attorney in an effort to resolve such issues and advance the case to issue.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request favorable reconsideration and early passage to issue of the present application.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our New York office by telephone at (212) 218-2100. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

  
Attorney for Applicants

Registration No. 29 286

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO  
30 Rockefeller Plaza  
New York, New York 10112-3801  
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

NY\_MAIN 399061 v1